



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDITOR'S TABLE.

It is difficult to eradicate from scientific literature a name or word which has become current, even after it has been found to be an expression of ignorance or error. Thus some names introduced into Zoology die hard. It is perfectly well-known that the grouping of forms named by Cuvier Pachydermata, is entirely unnatural, and the appropriate position of all of its contents has been exactly determined; yet the word occasionally crops up still in the literature. The supposed primary divisions of fishes Ganoidei and Teleostei, have a still more vigorous vitality, although it is perfectly clear that there is no use for either term. The supposed Ganoid division is thoroughly heterogeneous, its contents forming with the Teleostei a more comprehensive division, the Teleostomi of Owen, which naturally falls into several primary divisions three of which were included in the Ganoidei by Agassiz and Müller. Perhaps the most pestilent pretender of the list, is the word Amphibia, which is so frequently used instead of the proper name of the class Batrachia. The name Amphibia was originally applied to a combination of the Reptilia and Batrachia, before the fundamental differences between the two were known. When the Batrachia were first separated from the Reptilia, the new name was naturally applied to the new division, and the name Amphibia would have been more applicable to the larger division of its former self i. e. the Reptilia. As, however, its definition accorded with neither the Reptilia nor Batrachia, it was not used for either, nor was it introduced to take the place of Batrachia with a definition, until a few years ago by Huxley. This was done in defiance of the universal usage of naturalists at the time, and probably in ignorance of the real state of the case, since it frequently happens that men engaged in the real work of biological science, find questions of names irksome and stupid. Nevertheless it is a distinct advantage always to have but one name for one thing; and that name should be the oldest which was applied to the thing in question as determined by the definition given. Applying this principle, the name Batrachia has a quarter century priority over Amphibia.

In the April, 1896 number of this journal (p. 292) we published what purported to be a review of a work by Wachsmuth and Springer, which was signed by one of our frequent contributors. In a foot note the work is stated to have been published in 1895. We have learned

from leading authorities on the subject of the work, (the Crinoidea), that it was not published at the time the review was issued, nor is it yet published. We make this statement, since it is important that the date of publication of all books, especially scientific books, should be correctly ascertained and reported, and because we desire to prevent any confusion as to the date of this particular publication which might arise from our having published the review in question. As is usual with periodicals, we assume no responsibility for articles published in the NATURALIST unless they are anonymous.

The dates of publication of the numbers of the AMERICAN NATURALIST during the years 1895, and 1896 are as follows: for 1895; Jan., Jan. 15th; Feb., Feb. 14th; March, Mch. 6th; April, Apl. 9th; May, May, 13th; June, June 3d; July, July 9th; August, July 31st; Sept., Aug. 28th; Oct., Sept. 26th; Nov., Oct. 29th; Dec., Dec. 6th.

For 1896; Jan., Dec. 31st, 1895; Feb., Jan. 30th; March, Mch. 9th; April, Apl. 2d; May, May 2d; June, June 3d; July, July 2d; August, Aug. 6th; Sept., Sept. 9th; October, Oct. 3d; Nov., Nov. 2d; Dec., Dec. 5.

RECENT LITERATURE.

Gregory's Plant Anatomy.¹—Among the host of botanical textbooks that are constantly appearing, it is a pleasure to welcome one that is a contribution to certain departments of botanical literature, rather than a mere exposition of the laboratory and lecture methods, good, bad, and chiefly indifferent, of the author. While it is to be assumed that American investigations in histology and in cytology have not been lacking during these past few years, the fact remains that they have not as yet resulted in an increase of literature upon these subjects.

While there can be no doubt that the tide is setting steadily and strongly in the direction of higher things in cisatlantic botany, this is as yet a premonition rather than a fact, and the few texts leading toward this are to be regarded as pioneers and valued as such. These books are divisible into two classes, and in evaluating them, it is necessary to measure them by a proper standard. Thus, a book which purports to be a textbook should not be criticized because it does not manifest

¹ Elements of Plant Anatomy, by Emily L. Gregory, Ph. D. Professor of Botany in Barnard College. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1895, pp. VIII, 148. 8vo.